

## REMARKS

Response is made to the Office Action dated September 19, 2008. No new matter is added by this Response, and reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action is respectfully requested. This Response cancels claims 34-36 and adds new claims 43-44. Claims 43-44 recite only matter that was previously recited in claim 23 and its dependents.

We appreciate that the Examiner has withdrawn the Section 112 rejections contained in the prior Office Actions.

The Office Action tersely rejects each of our claims under Section 103, citing the combination of Huffman, Lin, Darago, Salisbury and Ball. Aside from a general statement that this combination of five references suggests each of our claimed features, however, the Office Action makes no attempt to apply the references to the particular features of our independent or dependent claims.

In particular, the Office Action makes no effort whatsoever to address the newly-claimed features in our various dependent claims, such as the features set forth in dependent claims 27-33. Many of these features are also recited in new independent claim 43. In the event that the rejections are maintained, we respectfully request that the Examiner set forth the particular bases for rejecting each feature of the various independent and dependent claims, including citations to the relevant portions of prior art references. In the absence of such information, the Office Action simply provides a blanket statement that each of our claimed features are “obvious”, without any basis in fact or law for such statements.

Further, although the Office Action combines five distinct references to arrive at this rejection, it provides insufficient basis for incorporating the Ball reference into the Section 103 combination. Even if executing actual flight management software on a multi-processor system is known, there is no basis whatsoever for asserting that it would be obvious to incorporate this feature into the Section 103 combination of Huffman, Lin, Darago, Salisbury and Ball. Ball, in particular, does not describe the “client-server” aspects of our claims, much less the features relating to a graphical library on the client (as recited in claims 27 and 43), updating instructions for a library of graphical imagery representing an electronic flight instrument system (as recited in claims 28 and 43), and routing the update instructions through the gateway (as recited in claims 29 and 43). Again, in the event that the rejections are maintained, we respectfully request

that the Examiner set forth the particular bases in the art for the rejections of our particular claimed features.

No official fee is believed to be due in connection with this Response. If, however, any time extension or additional fee is required to consider this response or to otherwise prevent abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension of time and as authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fees that may be due.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of Assignee,  
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.

Dated: December 19, 2008

By: /BRETT A. CARLSON/  
Brett A. Carlson  
Registration No. 39,928  
(480) 385-5060

**Ingrassia Fisher & Lorenz, P.C.**  
**Customer No. 00128**